

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

The title of the invention stands objected as allegedly not being descriptive

Claim 17 stands objected to because of an informality.

Claims 1-8 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over applicant's allegedly admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of USPN 5,977,562 to *Hirataka et al.*

Claims 9-12 and 16-19 stand allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Status of the Claims

Claim 17 has been amended, and claim 20 has been added to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are presently pending.

The Objection to Claim 17

Claim 17 stands objected to because of an informality. Applicant has amended claim 17 in accordance with the comments of the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claim 17 be withdrawn.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-8 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's allegedly admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of USPN 5,977,562 to *Hirataka et al.*

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 13, Applicants respectfully assert that AAPA and *Hirataka et al.*, whether taken singly or combined, do not teach or suggest a combination

including common electrodes and pixel electrodes that define concentric ring-shaped apertures. The Office Action admits that AAPA does not disclose this feature. However, the Office Action asserts that Figure 11 of *Hirataka et al.* discloses a liquid crystal display wherein the pixel electrode and the common electrode define concentric ring shaped apertures. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant respectfully asserts that Figure 11 of *Hirataka et al.* discloses common electrodes and pixel electrodes that define a single aperture that is spiral shaped – not concentric ring-shaped as recited by independent claims 1 and 13. Moreover, because the aperture is spiral shaped, there is only one aperture and not more than one as recited by independent claims 1 and 13.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent claims 1 and 13 are improper because the applied art, whether taken singly or combined, does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claims. Further, Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent claims 2-8 and 14-15 are allowable at least because of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 13.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully Submitted,

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP



Date: December 2, 2005

By:

Robert J. Goodell

Reg. No. 41,040

CUSTOMER NO. 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20004

Tel.: (202) 739-3000

Fax.: (202) 739-3001